arXiv:hep-ph/9305295v1 21 May 1993

Preprint IFUNAM
FT-93-015
May 1993

COMMENT ON "ELECTROMAGNETIC POTENTIAL VECTORS AND SPONTANEOUS SYMMETRY BREAKING"

V.V.Dvoeglazov[♯,†]

Depto de Fís.Teórica, Instituto de Física
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Mexico
Apartado Postal 20-364, 01000 Mexico, D.F. MEXICO

Abstract

The appearance of terms, which are analogous to ones required for symmetry breaking, in Lagrangian of Ref. [1] is shown to be caused by gauge invariance of quantum electrodynamics (QED) and by inaccuracy of the author in a choice of canonical variables. These terms in the Lagrangian (18) of [1] do not have physical meaning.

Submitted to "Nuovo Cimento B"

KEYWORDS: electrodynamics, canonical quantization, spontaneous symmetry breaking, gauge invariance
PACS: 03.50.De, 04.20.Cv, 04.20.Fy, 11.10.Ef

[♯] On leave from: *Dept.Theor.&Nucl.Phys., Saratov State University and Sci.&Tech. Center for Control and Use of Physical Fields and Radiations Astrakhanskaya str., 83, Saratov 410071 RUSSIA*

[†] Email: valeri@ifunam.ifisicacu.unam.mx
dvoeglazov@main1.jinr.dubna.su

In Ref. [1] the following k– space Lagrangian for electromagnetic field, interacting with the current $\vec{j}$ and with the charge density ρ, has been obtained:

$$\Lambda(\vec{k}) = i\Psi^{+}(\vec{k})\dot{\Psi}(\vec{k}) + \left[\vec{A}^{*}(\vec{k}) - \vec{k}\right]\vec{j}(\vec{k}) - m\bar{\Psi}(\vec{k})\Psi(\vec{k}) + \\ + \quad i\frac{\vec{k}\vec{C}^{*}(\vec{k})\rho(\vec{k})}{\vec{k}^{\,2}} - \frac{\mid \rho(\vec{k}) \mid^{2}}{2\vec{k}^{\,2}} + \frac{1}{2}\left(\mid \vec{C}_{\perp}(\vec{k}) \mid^{2} - \vec{k}^{2} \mid \vec{A}_{\perp}(\vec{k}) \mid^{2}\right). \tag{1}$$

The approach was used, in which $\vec{A}$, the vector potential, and $\vec{C} = \dot{\vec{A}} = \frac{\partial \vec{A}}{\partial t}$ are supposed to be independent to each other. The author of cited paper considers (1) as the Lagrangian with the spontaneous-symmetry-breaking terms (fourth and fifth in the above formula).

Let us mark, the approach using the additional vector variable (it is designated as $\vec{C}$ in Ref. [1]), which is different from field variables and is considered as independent, is not an innovation. This is just the well-known Hamiltonian canonical formalism (see e.g. [2]-[5]). In Ref. [4] the canonical-conjugated variable to A_{μ} is defined identically with the quantity $\vec{C}$ in [1], if we don't take into account the inessential coefficient $\frac{1}{4\pi}$:

$$\pi^{i} = \frac{1}{4\pi}\frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial(\partial_{t}A_{i})} = \frac{1}{4\pi}\frac{\partial \vec{A}}{\partial t}. \tag{2}$$

This canonical-conjugated quantities is appeared as a result of using the following Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{8\pi}A_{\mu,\nu}A^{\mu,\nu} = -\frac{1}{16\pi}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{8\pi}\frac{\partial A_{\mu}}{\partial x^{\nu}}\frac{\partial A^{\nu}}{\partial x_{\mu}} \tag{3}$$

But, in the case of the x– space Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu} \tag{4}$$

the quantities $\vec{A}$ and $\vec{C} = \dot{\vec{A}}$ are not the canonical-conjugated quantities, as opposed to the case of classical mechanics where $\vec{x}$, the coordinate, and $\dot{\vec{x}}$, the velocity, are, in fact, the canonical quantities. It is not clear, what quantzation procedure are implied by the author of Ref [1]. In the case of canonical quantization the Lagrangian $F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}$ does not give us π_0, which is equal to zero. In the case of Lagrange quantization it is not clear, what commutation rules should be implemented e.g. for $[\vec{A}(\vec{x}), \vec{C}(\vec{x'})]$. Moreover, in the Lagrange approach the field and the momenta of field are not considered as two independent quantities. It is also not obvious, how P_{μ}, the energy-momentum operator, is expressed by $\vec{A}$ and $\vec{C}$ in a quantum case.

Let us not forget, under quantization of electromagnetic field it is impossible to use the Lorentz condition *ab initio*. According to Fermi [6] it exists as the condition for the state vectors only. It is necessary to choose the definite Lagrangian and the definite quantization approach and only after setting up the commutation relations are we able to use the Lorentz condition in a weaker form:

$$\left(\frac{\partial A^{(-)}}{\partial x}\right)\Phi = 0. \tag{5}$$

In the case of the Lagrangian (3) we are able to quantizate electromagnetic field canonically, using the variable $\vec{\pi} = \dot{\vec{A}}$ as independent. Following the techniques of [1], we then have the additional terms to the k– space Lagrangian, which do contract one of the term in (1):

$$\mathcal{L}^{add} = -\frac{i}{\vec{k}^{\,2}}\rho(\vec{k})\left(\vec{k}\vec{C}^{*}(\vec{k})\right) + \frac{1}{\vec{k}^{\,2}}\left(\vec{k}\vec{C}(\vec{k})\right)\left(\vec{k}\vec{C}^{*}(\vec{k})\right) - \left(\vec{k}\vec{A}(\vec{k})\right)\left(\vec{k}\vec{A}^{*}(\vec{k})\right). \qquad (6)$$

The total Lagrangian does not contain the symmetry breaking terms.

As a result of gauge invariance of QED it is possible to use the other Lagrangians differing from (4) by the supplementary term $\frac{1}{\lambda}\left(\frac{\partial A}{\partial x}\right)^2$, which, on the first view, brings nothing in (18) of cited paper. However, in this case the canonical quantities are $\pi_0 = \frac{1}{\lambda}(\frac{\partial A^\mu}{\partial x^\mu})$ and $\pi^i = F^{i0}$ and the expressions (10, 11) between the canonical quantities in Ref. [1] are no longer kept.

Moreover, it is well-known that the Lagrangian can be defined up to the total derivative only. If we implement the function $\partial^\mu f_\mu = \partial^\mu (g \cdot h)_\mu$ it is easy to select g and h in such kind that both of the symmetry-breaking terms in (18) are contracted.

In the end, it is not clear, why the Coulomb gauge ($\vec{k}\cdot\vec{A} = 0$ and $\vec{k}\cdot\vec{C} = 0$) was used by the author of [1] in the formula (18), the Lagrangian, but was not used before, e.g. in (10) and (15).

In conclusion, the appearance of interaction terms of the form $a \cdot \mid \Psi \mid^2 + b \cdot \mid \Psi \mid^4$ in the QED Lagrangian is caused by gauge invariance of electrodynamics, implementing the Lorentz condition *ab initio*, inaccuracy of the author in the choice of canonical-conjugated quantities. These terms are nonphysical and can be eliminated as a result of using the appropriate gauge. Consequently, they have no any physical meaning in quantum theory.

I would still like to mention that investigations of interaction electromagnetic field with currents deserves serious elaboration. In Ref. [7] the equation was presented:

$$\begin{aligned}(-i\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu - m)\Psi(\vec{x}) &= \\ &= e^2\gamma^\mu\Psi(\vec{x})\int d\vec{y} D(\vec{x}-\vec{y})\bar{\Psi}(\vec{y})\gamma_\mu\Psi(\vec{y}) + e\gamma^\mu\Psi(\vec{x})A^{in}_\mu(\vec{x}) \qquad (7)\end{aligned}$$

(where $D(\vec{x}-\vec{y})$ is the Green's function for electromagnetic field, $A^{in}_\mu(\vec{x})$ is the solution of Maxwell's equations), which should be resolved (see also [5]).

I am very grateful to Prof. A. M. Cetto, Head of the Departamento de Física Teórica, IFUNAM, for creation of excellent conditions for investigations. The technical assistance of A. Wong is greatly acknowledged.

This work has been financially supported by the CONACYT (Mexico) under the contract No. 920193.

References

[1] J. V. Shebalin *Nuovo Cim.*, **108 B**, 99 (1993).

[2] A. Visconti *Quantum Field Theory. Vol. I* (Pergamon Press, 1969), p. 254.

[3] S. N. Gupta *Quantum Electrodynamics* (Gordon and Breach Sci.Publ., 1977), p. 59.

[4] A. A. Sokolov et al. *Quantum Electrodynamics* (Mir Publisher, Moscow, Russia, 1988), in English, p. 107. Revised from the 1983 Russian edition.

[5] G. Källén *Quantum Electrodynamics* (Springer-Verlag, 1972), p. 48.

[6] E. Fermi *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **4**, 87 (1932).

[7] *Foundations of Radiation Theory and Quantum Electrodynamics. Ed. A. O. Barut* (Plenum Press, 1980), p. 169.